

Application Number: 09/870,860

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments, which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for giving Applicant the opportunity to clarify the invention and discuss its merits during an interview on December 1, 2005. Inventors, Farah Moaven and Israel Laracuente, and Legal Representative, Julia Thomas, were present and discussed what Applicant considers to be differences between the invention and the prior art of record. The Examiner indicated that it would help to advance prosecution if Applicant amended the claims to clarify the invention, such as clarifying the separation of approval process from the access process and clarifying that the manager has the authority to negotiate rights and privileges for a job profile to the resources at a possibly completely different time from a member of a job profile actually accessing the resource.

2. **35 U.S.C. §103(a).**

- The Examiner stated that Claims 1-10, 12-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al, U.S. 6,161,139 (herein "Win") in view of Hudson, U.S. 6,055,637 (herein "Hudson").

Applicant respectfully traverses.

- The Win and Hudson systems are for real-time, for when a user is signed into each of their system and is trying access a resource. There is no separation of a prior approval process from the access process. Win's abstract is clear in that it is for real-time, as follows:

"When the user requests the execution of an administrative function, the requests [sic] is honored only when one of the user's administrative roles includes an administrative privilege that authorizes the requested administrative function."

Also, in neither Win nor Hudson are there steps for the manager negotiating for and a resource owner granting approval to the resources that are included in a profile that could be at any time prior to actually requesting access. In both prior art

Application Number: .09/870,860

5 references, there is one administration who unilaterally determines access to a resource. Neither Win nor Hudson provide separation of concerns: resource owners manage their resources, managers manage their users, as is important to the business problem being solved by the claimed invention. In fact, in Hudson, the only mention of approval is subsequent to a request for access, as follows in col. 4, lines 43-45:

10 "Central security administrator 60 also directs and forwards requests for accessing resource to the owner of the requested resource to seek approval."

This is precisely the problem that the claimed invention is solving.

15 Finally, the authorization process of the claimed invention is a pre-requisite to Win's and Hudson's process.

In stark contrast, the claimed invention solves the problem of the inefficient process where whenever a user of a computing enterprise desires to access a computing resource, the user first has to obtain approval from the resource owner before he or she may access the resource (see page 1, lines 15-23).

20 Applicant has amended all of the independent Claims to further clarify these two separate processes, which is not taught in the prior art. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification and no new matter has been introduced.

25 Therefore, in view of the amended independent claims and of the discussion hereinabove, Applicant is of the opinion that none of the prior art of records teach all the claims limitations. As such, the Claims are in allowable condition because they meets the conditions for allowance set forth by the applicable Patent Laws, Patent Office Rules, and ruling Case Law. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that
30 the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

3. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend the Claims solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In
35 making such cancellation and amendment, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which Applicant considers the invention herein to be entitled. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection

Application Number: 09/870,860

at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

Application Number: 09/870,860

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the present invention to be distinguished from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore allowed to issue as a United States patent. The Examiner is invited to call the Attorney/Agent at (650) 474-8400 to discuss the response.

Respectfully Submitted,



Julia A. Thomas

Reg. No. 52,283

Customer No. 22862